

PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

DATE: September 13, 2006

CALLED TO ORDER: 5:44 p.m.

ADJOURNED: 8:16 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Attending Members

Mary Moriarty Adams, Chair
Greg Bowes
Vernon Brown
Sherron Franklin
Lynn McWhirter
William Oliver
Lincoln Plowman

Absent Members

Scott Schneider

BUDGET HEARING

Review and Analysis

PROPOSAL NO. 430, 2006 - adopts the annual budget for the Police Special Service District for 2007

“Do Pass as Amended” Vote: 6-0

PROPOSAL NO. 431, 2006 - adopts the annual budget for the Fire Special Service District for 2007

“Do Pass as Amended” Vote: 6-0

PROPOSAL NO. 433, 2006 - adopts the annual budget for the Metropolitan Emergency Communications Agency for 2007

“Do Pass as Amended” Vote: 6-0

PROPOSAL NO. 436, 2006 - adopts the annual budget for Indianapolis and Marion County for 2007 (Public Safety and Criminal Justice portion only)

“Postpone” until September 18, 2006 Vote: 5-0

PUBLIC SAFETY AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE COMMITTEE

The Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee of the City-County Council met on Wednesday, September 13, 2006. Chair Mary Moriarty Adams called the meeting to order at 5:44 p.m., with the following members present: Greg Bowes, Vernon Brown, Sherron Franklin, Lynn McWhirter, William Oliver, and Lincoln Plowman. Absent was Scott Schneider.

PROPOSAL NO. 430, 2006 - adopts the annual budget for the Police Special Service District for 2007

Jeff Seidenstein, Budget Manager, explained amendments to Proposal No. 430, 2006 (Exhibit A, on file in the Council office). He also noted that a three percent (3%) salary increase has been added Character 01 in a majority of the various departments' budgets, for civilian employees that are not covered by collective bargaining agreements. The changes are as follows:

- The appropriations to the Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department (IMPD) out of the Indianapolis Police Department (IPD) fund are proposed to be \$143,814,859. Slight increases have been made in each character; however, no changes have been made to Character 05, Internal Charges.
- Proposed salary ranges have increased. There will now be 19 pay ranges instead of the current 16 pay ranges.
- The full time equivalents (FTE) for IMPD have been revised to a total of 2,028.52.
- One thousand six hundred and forty (1,640) sworn and authorized officers for IMPD; however, the budgeted FTEs are less than the authorized number. The budgeted FTEs for sworn officers are 1,604.
- The proposed tax rate for the IMPD fund is \$0.4389.
- The amount of County Option Income Tax (COIT) is decreasing in the IMPD fund because they added the auto excise, financial institution, and commercial vehicle excise tax, which was not included in the introduced budget.
- The IMPD fund will have a new COIT Anticipation Loan of \$14.8 in next year's budget. The total miscellaneous revenue for this fund is slightly under \$102 million.
- The amended sixteen line statement shows the correct balance for each line item.

- The revised net assessed valuation is slightly over \$9.9 billion, which makes the tax rate for the IMPD fund 0.4389.

Councillor Bowes asked if the three percent is causing an increase in the budget. Mr. Seidenstein said the budget was increased for salaries for civilians; however, there are other reductions in the budget that offset the salary increase.

Councillor Franklin asked if the Indianapolis Fire Department's (IFD) pay parity with IPD is included in the budget. Robert Clifford, City Controller, said that IFD and IPD contracts are currently in existence with evergreen clauses. Suzannah Overholt, Transition Director, said the IFD contract does not expire until the end of this year and she cannot recall if the pay parity is included in the contract or in a separate agreement. Councillor Franklin asked if the city has to pay IFD the same amount as IPD. Mr. Clifford said there are funds set aside for 2006 to pay IFD and this issue does not have to be address in the 2007 budget.

Councillor McWhirter asked if any raise for IFD or IPD in this proposed budget. Mr. Clifford said the budget includes IPD pay parity and charges for 2006 and 2007. He said there are funds set aside for the current pay difference between IPD and IFD. Councillor McWhirter asked if civilian positions will be reduced with the merging of administrative positions. Mr. Clifford replied in the affirmative.

Chair Moriarty Adams asked how many civilian positions were being reduced. Ms. Overholt said the reduction is 41 positions. She clarified that these positions are job titles that have vacancies, and they do not anticipate anyone losing their jobs.

[Clerk's note: Councillor Plowman left at 5:50 p.m.]

[Clerk's note: Chair Moriarty Adams asked for a five minute recess. The committee returned at 6:15 p.m.]

Chair Moriarty Adams said that Proposal No. 436, 2006 will be discussed tonight, but a vote will not be taken until Monday, September 18, 2006.

Councillor Brown asked what the authorized strength for IMPD is. Mr. Clifford said 1,232 positions are IPD and 408 sworn officers from the Marion County Sheriff's Department (MCSD), which equals the 1,640. He said 1,604 is what the city is able to fund in 2007.

Mr. Seidenstein said they do not have to budget for the full authorize strength because of attrition. He said as officers retire the ranks drop, but when a new recruit class graduates the ranks increase again. Mr. Seidenstein said they can only afford to budget for 1,604 officers. Mr. Clifford said it is anticipated that the 1,640 is a 2008 goal because of the hold on recruit classes this year.

Councillor Franklin asked if money is available for current recruitment classes. Mr. Clifford replied in the affirmative.

Councillor McWhirter asked how many civilian employees are from IPD and MCSD. Ms. Diller said she can provide that information before Monday's special meeting. Councillor Oliver asked if appropriate money is set aside for recruitment of minorities. Mr. Clifford said the reserve appropriation for recruitment can be found in Character 03, Other Services and Charges.

Councillor McWhirter asked for clarification on IMPD's budget overview that stated there are 1,607 civilian employees. Ms. Diller said she cannot verify those numbers at this time. She said the numbers have changed throughout the budget process and she ensures that the numbers they have in the proposed amendment are correct.

Councillor McWhirter asked what the \$19 million for Intergovernmental revenue is. Mr. Seidenstein said this is the pension relief the city receives from the state.

Councillor McWhirter asked if the 2006 assessed valuation for the police service district included the whole county. Mr. Clifford said they decided not to create a special service district; instead they use funding from the COIT to fund the law enforcement division that will go to the county. Mr. Seidenstein said the assessed valuation for police service district and IMPD fund is the same geographical territory, but changes in state legislation is impacting the assessed valuation. He said they are taking a conservative approach in estimating assessed values in order to protect the tax levy that funds the budget.

Councillor Bowes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown to amend Proposal No. 430, 2006 per Exhibit A. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Councillor Bowes moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver to send Proposal No. 430, 2006 to the full Council with a "Do Pass as Amended" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 431, 2006 - adopts the annual budget for the Fire Special Service District for 2007

Mr. Clifford explained amendments to Proposal No. 431, 2006 (Exhibit B, on file in the Council office). The changes are as follows:

- Written documentation within the proposed budget has been revised to include the Washington Township Fire Department (WTFD).
- \$14.4 million in miscellaneous revenue for the fire service district is being reallocated to the county general fund.

- The transfer of \$13,254,673 from IFD special service district is the tax levy that will remain in IFD's special service district. There will be one fire department, but two taxing districts.
- The original estimated funds to be raised for the fire service district (page 5 of Exhibit B) have been stricken and replaced with page 7 of Exhibit B to include the WTFD.
- The entire fire service district will have a tax levy of .1985, due to the agreement that the levy and tax rate for Washington Township would not increase for a year and a half.
- The fire service district that excludes Washington Township (which is a separate levy only on the old IFD special service district) will have a \$25,000 balance at the end of 2006. The tax levy for 2007 and carry over from 2006 of the fund balance will be \$13,254,673.
- Fire Cumulative Capital Development including Washington Township (page 9 of Exhibit B) has been added to the proposed budget with a lower tax rate of .0072.
- Additional amendments (technical) were made to the amendment found in Exhibit B.

Mr. Clifford said the authorized strength for IFD is 117 FTE civilians, 865 uniformed FTE, and one part time FTE for a total of 982.88.

Councillor Franklin asked if IFD pay parity is included in this budget. Mr. Clifford replied in the affirmative. Councillor Franklin asked where the pay parity is located in the budget. Mr. Clifford said pay parity would be projected in Character 01, but it is still being negotiated. Councillor Brown said currently IFD is in contract negotiations with the city. He said in IFD's current contract they have pay parity with IPD. He said whether they have pay parity with IMPD is a contractual issue that is being negotiated and would not be in the proposed budget. Councillor Franklin asked if money is needed in the budget to cover pay parity. Mr. Brown replied in the negative because it is a contract issue. Mr. Seidenstein said once the contract is settled they may have to come back to the Council to amend the budget.

Councillor McWhirter asked if the tax rates for the current IFD district fund the entire IFD budget or if they have expenditures out of other funds. Mr. Clifford said for the most part tax rates are for the entire funding of IFD. He said some funding could come from the county cumulative fund.

Councillor Bowes moved, seconded by Councillor Franklin to amend Proposal No. 431, 2006 per Exhibit B. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

James Greeson, Chief of IFD, gave a brief update on the work being done to merge the WTFD and IFD.

Councillor Bowes moved, seconded by Councillor Oliver to send Proposal No. 431, 2006 to the full Council with a "Do Pass as Amended" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 433, 2006 - adopts the annual budget for the Metropolitan Emergency Communications Agency (MECA) for 2007

Mr. Seidenstein explained amendments to Proposal No. 433, 2006 (Exhibit C, on file in the Council office). The changes are as follows:

- The proposed tax rate for the sinking fund is \$0.0179.
- The COIT allocation for the MECA fund is \$9.9 million for a total fund balance of \$10,186,000.
- E-911 fees have been lowered due to revenues decreasing because of the use of cell phones. The sinking fund total fund balance is \$1,771,515.
- MECA's 16 line statement shows a proposed fund balance of \$157,571.
- The Sinking fund 16 line statement reflects proposed changes previously discussed and found in Exhibit B.
- Clarification was made to show AT&T distributions of revenue to various agencies that have emergency dispatch.

Councillor Bowes asked why \$6.6 million is remaining in the County Emergency Telephone System Fund. Mr. Seidenstein said this is a restricted fund and the MECA board is planning to use these funds to pay for the new communication system.

Councillor Brown asked if it is necessary for AT&T to still distribute fees to the MCSD, due to the combined law enforcement (IMPD). Mr. Seidenstein said most likely the two distribution percentages will be added together to allocate for dispatch operation. Councillor Brown asked if an ordinance from the Council is necessary to change the previous layout of distribution. Mr. Seidenstein said the Council did not do an allocation; they passed the increase in the E-911 fees. He said the percentages can be changed by doing an amendment; however, all allocations are going to the MCSD because IMPD is a part of the MCSD. Mr. Clifford said they will report back to the committee on whether or not a change is needed in the distribution.

Councillor Bowes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown to amend Proposal No. 433, 2006 per Exhibit C. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

Councillor Bowes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown to send Proposal No. 433, 2006 to the full Council with a "Do Pass as Amended" recommendation. The motion carried by a vote of 6-0.

PROPOSAL NO. 436, 2006 -adopts the annual budget for Indianapolis and Marion County for 2007 (Public Safety and Criminal Justice portion only)

Mr. Clifford said the amended portion of this proposal will only be discussed not voted on (Exhibit D, on file in the Council office). He said some departments experience increases in Character 01 to reflect the CJPC recommendations and the salary increases for civilian employees. The changes to the proposal are as follows:

- The previous Section 1.01 (k) has been replaced with the amended version (found on page 2 of Exhibit D). The changes separate the appropriation for IFD from the Department of Public Safety (DPS).
- In addition to the three percent (3%) the County Clerk will also have an increase in Character 01 to move some employees to the minimum salary grade.
- The Superior Court probation officers will receive an increase by a state mandated pay schedule and not the three percent (3%) salary increase.
- The increase in Superior Court's Character 03 is due to money being moved back to the County General fund because of technical issues to pay for clinic costs for juveniles.
- Increase in Character 03 of the Sheriff Civil Fees fund is to reflect a charge from fleet services for maintenance on the vehicles.
- In the consolidated county fund there will be a transfer out to the county general fund to make up the appropriations that the various county agencies will need to carry out due to the executive order issued for the remainder of this year. The transfer is in the amount of \$1.5 million.
- There is a proposed transfer into the county general fund from the juvenile debt service fund in the amount of \$20,100,951 and a transfer from the county rainy day fund of \$686,428. The total amount to be transferred to the county general fund is \$20,787,379.
- The 16 line statement for the consolidated county fund reflects a tax rate that will not be higher than 0.0613.

Councillor Franklin asked if the COIT money that was given to the agencies in 2006 has been used as agreed. Mr. Seidenstein said that money has been spent as agreed and will continue to be used up to the end of this year.

Councillor McWhirter asked if transferring funds is an appropriate use of a rainy day fund. Mr. Seidenstein replied in the affirmative and said the county general fund is in bad shape and they are trying to find as much money as possible to support all the spending that is needed for the county agencies. Councillor McWhirter asked if a special appropriation is needed before funds are transferred. Mr. Seidenstein said if the Council approves this budget then in return they approve the transfer of funds. Mr. Brown said one of the uses of the rainy day fund is to avoid tax increases.

Councillor Bowes asked if the rainy day fund was created by ordinance. Mr. Brown said the ordinance is dictated by the state in order to receive the money and offset any tax increases.

[Clerk's note: Councillor Franklin left at 8:05 p.m.]

Mr. Clifford said the majority of the \$6 million balance of the consolidated county fund pertains to the sub-fund for permit fees in the Department of Metropolitan Development (DMD). He said on page 15 of the 16 line statement (found in Exhibit D) there is a negative balance of \$5,871,831 in the county general fund and the budget cannot be passed with a negative balance.

Councillor Bowes moved, seconded by Councillor Brown to "Postpone" Proposal No. 436, 2006 until September 18, 2006. The motion carried by a vote of 5-0.

CONCLUSION

With no further business pending, and upon motion duly made, the Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee of the City-County Council was adjourned at 8:16 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Moriarty Adams, Chair
Public Safety and Criminal Justice Committee

MMA/as

